

Kids Club & Moms Empowerment

Children's Mental Health: Trauma

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2019. Literature review updated July 2018.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

Program Description: Kids Club & Moms Empowerment are concurrent interventions for children and their mothers who have experienced intimate partner violence. Kids Club is a ten-week manualized group intervention for children, which aims to improve the child's sense of safety, foster emotional adjustment, and encourage appropriate social behavior. Moms Empowerment is a ten-week manualized parenting program and support group which meets at the same time as the Kids Club intervention. This intervention aims to improve parenting and enhance mothers' social and emotional adjustment. The program is designed to consist of ten weekly sessions. In the study in this analysis, children participating in Kids Club received about seven therapeutic hours over ten weeks, and their mothers in Moms Empowerment also received about seven therapeutic hours over ten weeks.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$5,468	Benefit to cost ratio	\$24.93
Participants	\$9,597	Benefits minus costs	\$16,465
Others	\$1,648	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	\$440	benefits greater than the costs	81 %
Total benefits	\$17,153		
Net program cost	(\$688)		
Benefits minus cost	\$16,465		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2018). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Benefits from changes to: ¹	Benefits to:				
	Participants	Taxpayers	Others ²	Indirect ³	Total
Crime	\$0	\$2	\$5	\$1	\$9
Labor market earnings associated with high school graduation	\$65	\$28	\$36	\$0	\$129
K-12 grade repetition	\$0	\$3	\$0	\$2	\$5
K-12 special education	\$0	\$7	\$0	\$4	\$11
Health care associated with internalizing symptoms	\$24	\$83	\$86	\$42	\$235
Costs of higher education	(\$7)	(\$5)	(\$2)	(\$2)	(\$16)
Subtotals	\$82	\$119	\$125	\$46	\$372
From secondary participant					
Labor market earnings associated with PTSD	\$9,098	\$3,873	\$0	\$0	\$12,972
Health care associated with PTSD	\$417	\$1,476	\$1,523	\$738	\$4,154
Subtotals	\$9,516	\$5,349	\$1,523	\$738	\$17,126
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$344)	(\$344)
Totals	\$9,597	\$5,468	\$1,648	\$440	\$17,153

¹In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

²"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

³"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	\$1,761	2015	Present value of net program costs (in 2018 dollars)	(\$688)
Comparison costs	\$1,035	2010	Cost range (+ or -)	10 %

Per-participant costs are based on average therapist time, as reported in the included study. Kids Club and Moms Empowerment support groups are both run by two therapists, so a group of four therapists total provides this treatment. These therapists provide ten therapeutic hours to children participating in Kids Club and to their mothers in Moms Empowerment. Hourly therapist cost is based on the actuarial estimates of reimbursement for family treatment (Mercer. (2016). Behavioral health data book for the state of Washington for rates effective January 1, 2017). For comparison group costs we use 2010 Washington State DSHS data to estimate the average reimbursement rate for treatment of child/adolescent post-traumatic stress disorder.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in non-discounted dollars to simplify the “break-even” point from a budgeting perspective. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Treatment age	Primary or secondary participant	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
					First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated				
					ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age	ES	p-value
Externalizing behavior symptoms	8	Primary	1	61	-0.009	0.201	8	-0.005	0.120	11	-0.019	0.921
Internalizing symptoms	8	Primary	1	61	-0.163	0.191	8	-0.163	0.191	10	-0.327	0.088
Post-traumatic stress	33	Secondary	1	61	-0.190	0.196	33	-0.190	0.196	34	-0.380	0.054

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Graham-Bermann, S.A., Lynch, S., Banyard, V., DeVoe, E.R., & Halabu, H. (2007). Community-based intervention for children exposed to intimate partner violence: an efficacy trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*(2), 199-209.
- Graham-Bermann, S.A., & Miller, L.E. (2013). Intervention to reduce traumatic stress following intimate partner violence: an efficacy trial of the Moms' Empowerment Program (MEP). *Psychodynamic Psychiatry, 41*(2), 329-350.

For further information, contact:
(360) 664-9800, Institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 10-17-2020



Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors-representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities-governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.